

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case Number 08-20520
Honorable David M. Lawson

MAURICE PETERSON,

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO REDUCE SENTENCE
PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. § 3582

On March 25, 2009, the defendant, Maurice Peterson, pleaded guilty to one count of conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent to distribute 50 grams or more of cocaine base, one count of conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent to distribute five kilograms or more of cocaine, and one count of conspiracy to unlawfully use a communication facility to commit a drug trafficking offense. He was sentenced to 120 months imprisonment on the first two counts and forty-eight months imprisonment on the third, to be served concurrently.

Now before the Court is the defendant's motion to reduce his sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c). The defendant argues that he is entitled to have his sentence reduced because the United States Sentencing Commission, following the enactment of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010, issued new and more lenient sentencing guidelines applicable to offenses involving crack cocaine. Those guidelines were made retroactive by the Sentencing Commission as of November 1, 2011.

Under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2), a court may modify a term of imprisonment after it is imposed only under certain conditions:

[I]n the case of a defendant who has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment *based on a sentencing range* that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(o), upon motion of the defendant or the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, or on its own motion, the court may reduce the term of imprisonment, after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a) to the extent that they are applicable, if such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission.

(Emphasis added). The defendant argues that because the Sentencing Commission has reduced the crack cocaine guidelines and made them retroactive, and his crime involved the distribution of crack cocaine, he is entitled to a sentence reduction.

The United State Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit has held that a defendant subjected to a statutory mandatory minimum sentence is not eligible for a sentence reduction under section 3582(c)(2) because the guideline amendment does not lower the defendant's applicable guideline range. *United States v. Johnson*, 564 F.3d 419, 423 (6th Cir. 2009). Subsequently, that court held that the Sentencing Commission's amendment to a sentencing guideline range that does not affect a statutory mandatory minimum sentence will not provide the basis for a subsequent reduction of a sentence under section 3582(c)(2). *United States v. McPherson*, 629 F.3d 609, 611 (6th Cir. 2011).

The Court believes that the defendant's motion is governed by the precedent set forth in *Johnson* and *McPhearson*. Because the defendant's sentence is based on the statutory mandatory minimum and not a sentencing guideline range that was later lowered by the Sentencing Commission, he is not eligible for relief.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the defendant's motion for reduction of sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c) [dkt. # 54] is **DENIED**.

s/David M. Lawson
DAVID M. LAWSON
United States District Judge

Dated: November 30, 2011

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first class U.S. mail on November 30, 2011.

s/Deborah R. Tofil
DEBORAH R. TOFIL